

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT FORM THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JANICE PICKETT

Creditor/Objector

V
In re

CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN,
Debtor/
_____ /

Chapter 9
Case No. 13-53846
Magistrate Judge:
Thomas J. Tucker

**OBJECTION TO NOTICE OF MOTION OF THE CITY OF
DETROIT, PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 105(a) AND 502(c) OF THE
BANKRUPTCY CODE AND BANKRUPTCY RULE 3021, FOR AN
ORDER APPROVING RESERVE AMOUNT FOR CERTAIN DIS-
PUTED OR UNLIQUIDATED UNSECURED CLAIMS IN CON-
NECTION WITH DISTRIBUTIONS TO BE MADE UNDER THE
EIGHTH AMENDED PLAN FOR THE ADJUST-MENT OF THE
CITY OF DETROIT**

NOW COMES the above creditor/objector in this response object to
the document disguised as a notice pursuant to Section 105(a) and 502(c) of
the bankruptcy code and bankruptcy rule 3021 for an order approving
reserve amount for certain disputed or unliquidated unsecured claims in
connection with distributions to be made under the Eighth Amended Plan

for the Adjustment of the city of Detroit and for the following reasons:

1) The Plan of Adjustment, confirmation of the plan and any thing connected or stemming from the plan of Adjustment was not filed in good faith and has to complied with the bankruptcy code and rules 11 USC 923 governing the notice. There have been numerous objections to method of your way of so called notifying people in the following objection Docket Number: 8306, 8233, 8314, 8428 8310.

2) I have not been legally notified personally or publicly and a associate just stumble across it on the internet. We have not been notified and most the people contacted have not received a notice and more time is need to consult legal assistant and advice.

3) We object further to this notice also because there never was a legal vote on the plan the only attempt was with counterfeit ballots and violation of the election laws. The plan of adjustment and confirmation of the plan was unconstitutional and deprived and denied us Basic Civil Right 42 USC 1983 and due process of law of the 5th and 14th Amendments of the Constitution of the United States.

2) We also objected to the impairment and diminishing the health care and pension benefits that is protected by Article 9 Section 24 Constitution of

the State of Michigan and the 10th Amendment of the Federal Constitution.

3) The pension has double from two and half (2 1/2) billion to four and half to five (4 1/2) to 5 Billion from 2012 to 2014.

4) We never had a hearing and as stated above no notice as well and this violated the Supreme Court Decision a person must have timely and adequate notice detailing the reasons for the notice and an effective opportunity to defend. Goldberg v. Kelly 397 U.S. 254 (1970) citing Armstrong v. Manzo, U.S. 545, 552 (1965).

5) We object and disagree with your letter because the so-called Recoupment and it doesn't apply to me or any other retirees and/or pensioners because there no grounds to recoup. The word recoupment means "It is keeping back something which is due because there is an equitable reason to withhold it; and is uniformly applied where a man bring an action for breach of a contract between him and the defendant; and where the latter can show that some stipulation in the same contract was made by the plaintiff, which he has violated, the defendant may, if he choose, instead of suing in his turn, recoupe his damages arising from the breach committed by the plaintiff. Ives v. Van Epps 22 Wend, N.Y. 156. And see Barber v. Chapin, 28 Vt. 413 Black's Law Dictionary revised 4th Edition. We don't

owe anything and have not agree to pay anything and their is no contract of recoupment.

WHEREFORE and all the above facts and law we Object to this notice Section 105(a), 502(c) and Bankruptcy Rule 3021 and request that this notice be voluntary rescinded, withdrawn or cancel or be declared null and void because of its failure to be presented in good faith and failure to comply with the Bankruptcy Rules and code and contravening due process of the law.

Sincerely submitted



Name interest party/creditor/objector

Address: 9857 Daljoue

City and state Detroit, MI 48224

Date 3/23/2015

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JANICE PICKETT

Name

v

In re:
CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN
AND EMERGENCY MANAGER
KEVYN D. ORR

Chapter 9
Case No. 13-53846
Magistrate judge:
Thomas J. Tucker

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
E.D. MICHIGAN-DETROIT

2015 MAR 23 P 3:02

FILED

Debtor


PROOF OF SERVICE

JANICE PICKETT
deposes and

, being first duly sworn
Say that on March 23 2015. I sent a copy of Notice of motion of the City
of Detroit, pursuant to section 105(a) and 502 (c) of the bankruptcy code
and Rule 3021 for order approving reserve amount for certain disputed or
unliquidated unsecured claims in connection with distributions to be made
under the Eighth amended plan of adjustment of the city of Detroit of
Magistrate Judge Thomas J Tucker, upon the concern parties by certified
mail at the following address:

City of Detroit
Corporation Council
First National Building
600 Woodward Ave
Detroit, Michigan 48226

I/We hereby certify that the statements made herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, under penalty of perjury and contempt of Court under the laws of the United States of America.

Sign  _____